2 September 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR: BARS/CLAS Implementation Team

STAT   FROM:

SUBJECT: Meeting To Discuss System Numbers

The following memorandum was produced jointly by the undersigned and the Chief of the Supply Team.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On Tuesday, 1 September, a meeting was held between the members of the BARS/CLAS team to discuss the numbering scheme for the system.

The first number addressed was the requisition number. This is the proposed number that is used for requesting both materiel and services including travel. It will be input to the requisition function of the purchasing module and will control and track the request. The requisition subsequently generates the commitment to the appropriate account key within funds control.

Several numbering scheme options were presented for requisitioning materiel and possibly services. There were three suggestions utilizing various combinations of the Customer Identification Code (CIC), the Fiscal Year and the sequential number as follows:

1. Use the CIC with a one-digit Fiscal Year and a four-digit sequential number. e.g. 0615-7-0001.

2. Use the CIC with a two-digit Fiscal Year and a three-digit sequential number. e.g. 0615-87-001.

3. Use an abbreviated CIC (three digits) with a two-digit Fiscal Year and a four-digit sequential number. e.g. 615-87-0001.

They proposed that one of these numbering schemes be used on all requests. At this point an issue arose over the feasibility of

using this format, and specifically the CIC, on such requests as services (currently Form 2420), travel, field transactions, etc. It was proposed that services, travel, etc. utilize a format such as a letter to differentiate between types of transactions, a two digit office code and a four digit sequential number. The question was raised as to why the office code, an integral part of the account key, needs to be repeated within the request number when a CIC would provide a more detailed breakdown. This remains an open issue as to whether or not all requests should incorporate a CIC. The premise being that the office code and fiscal year is part of the account code.

STAT

The next number addressed was the account code. [   ] explained its structure as follows:

A three-digit ORG

A ten digit ACCOUNT

A Ten digit CENTER

A one-digit subledger ID

A one-digit subledger account

e.g. CA6   42212607   770002   E   A or B

She also stated that in release 1.3, the account code will be expanded.

This then gave rise to several points of contention. The first is that this number is too long. The next was who would be responsible for inputting it - the customer or B&F officer. The third was would the system be allowed to validate the funds availability without human intervention.

The major concern regarding the account key was that requestors (customers) are not familiar with the general ledger accounts and sub-object classes (SOC) that are required contigent upon the types of transactions. e.g. there are four SOC's for materiel and four for equipment as well as the various ones for services. Additionally, the account key must be reviewed and corrected by line item, a rather time consuming function. This would be true no matter who would have to input it i.e. the requestor or the B&F officer.

It was further raised that this should be resolved prior to the prototyping effort as it will impact on how closely it simulates the real world environment.

The issues that need to be resolved are:

1. Will automated funds validation be allowed without intervention of a B&F officer in the requisition process.

2. Who will input the account key. The B&F officer or the user?

3. Can the account key be shortened? This would require a table look-up and thus supplementary programming would be required.

STAT